DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 171 24 SP 008 351

AUTHOR	Soptick, John M.; Clothier, Grant M.
TITLE	CUTE Installation and Diffusion Project. Second Phase. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Mid-Continent Regional Educational Lab., Inc., Kansas City, Mo.
SPONS AGENCY	Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Mo.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Cooperative Research Program.
BUREAU NO	BR-2-0832
PUB DATE	Jul 74
GRANT	OEG-0-72-4522
NOTE	67p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Diffusion; Educational Innovation; Effective Teaching; *Information Dissemination; *Preservice Education; Teacher Education; Teacher Educator Education; *Teacher Programs; Transfer of Training; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	*Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program; CUTE; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title IV; ESEA Title IV

ABSTRACT

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE) Project was initiated in 1967 by the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) to design an intensive, field-oriented undergraduate program to prepare effective teachers for inner-city schools. The results is a 16-week program which is conducted during the student teaching semester and which has as its major objectives the development of the teacher's ability to understand the environment, attitudes, culture, insecurities, and prejudices of himself and his students, and the development of teacher competency in inquiry teaching methods. After developing the program, McREL designed a diffusion project in two phases. The objectives of Phase I were to select installation sites and establish CUTE programs using specially trained installer teams recruited from the site staff. Phase 1 evaluation consisted of testing program students and site-visit reports by McREL monitors. All eight sites proved to be operating successful CUTE programs. Phase 2 of the diffusion program utilized the original eight installation sites in further diffusion of the CUTE program to 20 additional universities. Again, evaluation consisted of testing students and on-site reports by McREL monitors. Evaluation reports are positive and show that the 28 sites operate effective programs and that of the almost 2000 graduates, most intend to remain in inner-city schools and almost all are highly successful, according to their supervisors. (HMD)

ED 095171

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL REPORT - SECOND PHASE

CUTE INSTALLATION AND DIFFUSION PROJECT

July, 1974

John M. Soptick
Research and Evaluation Specialist

Grant M. Clothier
Project Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory
L. C. Nixon, Jr., Executive Director
104 East Independence Avenue
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

The project discussed herein was supported by the U. S. Office of Education Grant OEG-0-72-4522.

SP008 351

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE COOPERATIVE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT	1
BACKGROUND	1
PROGRAM RATIONALE	2
PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT	3
PROGRAM RECOGNITION	6
SUMMARY OF PHASE I DIFFUSION PROJECT	7
OBJECTIVES	7
PROCEDURES	8
EVALUATION	11
SUMMARY OF PHASE II DIFFUSION PROJECT	14
OBJECTIVES	14
PROCEDURES	15
Scope-of-Work Activities of Sites	16
Training Workshops	19
Enrollment	21
Involvement with AACTE	23
Memphis State Workshop	25
EVALUATION	26
Monitors' Reports	27
Testing of CUTE Students	30
The CUTE Quiz	31
The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI)	32
Analysis	34
Results	37

PAGE

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CUTE DIFFUSION PROJECT 1973-74 39

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS. 40

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Appendix D

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE COOPERATIVE URBAN TEACHER EDUCATION DIFFUSION PROJECT

BACKGROUND

The Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE) program was initiated in 1967 amid urban problems manifested throughout the country. The purpose for generating the CUTE program was to design an intensive, field-oriented undergraduate program to prepare effective teachers for inner-city schools. The emphasis of this pre-service program was to prepare teachers to work in environmental situations and with youngsters whose educational and social backgrounds differ markedly from their own.

The CUTE program was developed at the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, one of 20 Regional Laboratories and Research and Development Centers established under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10. In addition to USOE support, financial assistance for development of the program was received from the NDEA Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, a grant from the Danforth Foundation, tuition rebates by participating colleges, and support from the Multi-purpose Training Center at the University of Missouri and the two Kansas City Public School Systems.

The pilot program established cooperative relationships between McREL and 13 liberal arts colleges in Missouri and Kansas and the public school systems of Kansas City, Missouri, and Kansas City, Kansas. After one and one-half years of pilot testing at the original Kansas City site, the program was expanded in 1968 to include educational institutions in and

around two additional metropolitan areas, Wichita, Kansas, and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. These two sites plus a center at Omaha, Nebraska, which was initiated and supported completely by local funds, served as locations for extensive field testing.

PROGRAM RATIONALE

Most prospective teachers are drawn from the middle-class strata of our society and are upwardly mobile. They attend teacher education institutions which are staffed by individuals with similar backgrounds. They encounter a curriculum generally perpetuating the middle-class value system. These typically white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, middle-class teachers are thus equipped to teach in a school setting populated with pupils from a similar background. However, when these teachers accept a position in an inner-city school, they frequently encounter a culture foreign to their own. They find the values they esteem are unknown to the pupils they teach. A gulf exists between the experiences of a teacher and the environment in which his pupils exist; this gulf is widened further by an inadequate basis for communication and understanding.

Unfortunately, many teacher education programs have failed to provide experiences designed to foster feelings of self-adequacy in prospective teachers and have not encouraged the development of teaching skills appropriate to the needs of inner-city pupils. In traditional student teaching programs most pre-service teachers engage in limited field experiences. Few opportunities are available to actually engage in any

kind of community activities other than classroom-related because of the short duration of time in the training program. Thus, often first-year teachers in schools in the heart of our urban areas are not prepared to deal effectively with the educational and psychological problems of their pupils.

If this situation is to be corrected, prospective teachers must be given experiences upon which to base realistic perceptions concerning the environment and the life styles of the inner-city children. In addition to these experiences, intensive preparation related to the psychological and sociological needs of inner-city children must be integral parts of pre-service education programs.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT

CUTE requires a cooperative effort between participating colleges or universities, public school systems and local communities. The program is designed to replace the regular student-teaching program for those students who express an interest in teaching in urban schools. CUTE is a 16-week program conducted during the semester in which the student is enrolled for student teaching and has as its major objectives preparing the teacher to:

A. Understand his own and his pupils' environment and culture;

B. Comprehend his own and his pupils' attitudes, insecurities, anxieties and prejudices; and

C. Understand and possess competency in inquiry teaching methods.

To establish the desired degree of awareness and understanding in prospective inner-city teachers, the CUTE program is divided into three substantive components: mental health, sociocultural, and teacher education, all carried out within the framework of a series of interdisciplinary seminars and field studies.

The initial emphasis in the program is given to observations in schools, field experiences in the community and seminars in teacher education, sociology and mental health. The student gradually assumes full student teaching responsibilities during the last half of the program as an integral part of the total training experience. The field experiences and the school in which the student does his student teaching should be in a community similar to a locale in which he/she hopes to do full-time teaching after completing the CUTE program.

Through the sociocultural component, students are required to participate in many field experiences in the community in which they will be teaching. Students do more than tour designated neighborhoods. Volunteer work with community agencies, tutoring pupils in their homes, observing in the waiting room of a hospital in the community, or doing a sociological case study of an individual pupil throughout the semester are examples of sociological activities in which CUTE students might engage. A vital part of the program is the "live-in," an arrangement in which each student spends a period of time with a family in the community--perhaps the greatest learning experience for participating students. Resource persons from the community also interact with students on various topics throughout the semester. Such immersion in the community provides student teachers with a more practical understanding of the lives of residents of the community so that they may effectively relate to the pupils whom they eventually teach. The end product is an internalization of feelings and understandings about community life which enables the CUTE student teacher to interpret and act upon variables influencing student learning, resulting in positive learning outcomes for pupils.

Not to be overlooked is the mental health component of the CUTE program. For teachers to be able to cope with their everyday problems in schools, particularly in an environment which has previously been foreign to them, they must understand themselves. Through free-wheeling discussion sessions under the guidance of a psychologist or psychiatrist, CUTE student teachers delve into their anxieties, prejudices, attitudes and defense mechanisms. The reason why they want to be teachers in the first place and the teacher's relationship to pupils, school personnel and people in the community are explored. Children's emotional and psychological development are studied and discussed. Gradually, the CUTE students become more open and honest with themselves and with others; they become more secure, emotionally mature and self-confident. The mental health component helps prepare the student teacher to better cope with the immediate pressures of involvement in the CUTE program and the pressures the teacher will face in his or her everyday problems with students during their teaching careers.

The third aspect of the CUTE program, teacher education, places emphasis on inquiry teaching methods. The inquiry approach to learning strives to reduce the authoritarian role of the teacher in the classroom and encourages pupil participation. Such an approach by teachers modifies the classroom role of pupils who are confronted with situations where answers are not immediately apparent, where it is necessary to pause, to look for possible solutions, and finally, to reach whatever conclusions the studies appear to require. On this basis, pupils are encouraged to ask questions, to suggest alternatives and to explore possible solutions.

In summary, the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education program is an intensive training program in which the student teacher gains knowledge of appropriate teaching strategies and learns about himself and the life-styles of the pupils he or she will be teaching.

PROGRAM RECOGNITION

Perhaps of most importance are the results of a three-year follow-up study of program graduates. These results indicate that when compared with a group of non-CUTE graduates, a significantly greater proportion of CUTE graduates are teaching in the inner city, planning to remain in inner-city schools, planning to teach in inner-city schools in the future, attending graduate school, or working in social service fields related to the economically disadvantaged areas of the inner city. CUTE graduates have consistently ranked higher than non-CUTE graduates in the evaluations of administrative personnel responsible for their supervision while employed in inner-city schools.

The United States Commissioner of Education's 1969-70 Report on the Education Profession included the CUTE program among "programs that have made outstanding attempts to bring together many of the elements necessary for a realistic, practical preparation for teachers of the economically disadvantaged."

Robert Wheeler, USOE associate commissioner of education and formerly director of urban education for the Kansas City, Missouri, school system stated, "The CUTE program has produced the most powerful teachers we have been privileged to employ in our system."

Similar recognition has been given to the program by educational organizations:

- In 1970, AACTE conferred upon the program its Distinguished Achievement Award for Excellence in Teacher Education.
- The National Center for Educational Communication selected it as one of ten innovative programs featured in a national traveling exhibit currently appearing throughout the country.
- The Bell Telephone Company selected it as a topic for its Educational Seminar Series to be shown to a national audience of executives in business, industry, government and education.
- In 1971, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) recommended the program to the National Center for Educational Communication (NCEC) as one of five educational programs supported by USOE which merit dissemination. Of the five programs selected by ETS, it was the only one dealing with the preparation of inner-city teachers.

Based on the ETS evaluation, the National Center for Educational Communication made a 14-month grant to McREL for the purpose of installing and diffusing the CUTE program in eight major metropolitan centers across the nation.

SUMMARY OF PHASE I DIFFUSION PROJECT

OBJECTIVES

The Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory received notice to proceed on the CUTE Diffusion Project on June 5, 1972. Objectives of the project were delineated as follows:

A. To inform target audiences (urban school systems, institutions

of higher education and state education agencies) of the opportunity to participate in a developed and tested inner-city teacher training program;

B. To select from target audiences those installation sites that offer the greatest potential for self-sustaining installation for the CUTE program;

C. To train installer teams from selected sites in the techniques essential to the installation of the program;

D. To enhance further transportability of the program by providing trained installer teams with training procedures enabling them to conduct regional training programs;

E. To provide technical assistance to installation sites during the first year's operational cycle--this assistance to be provided by McREL trained monitoring staff.

PROCEDURES

Upon receiving official notice, the Laboratory immediately developed a list of 40 institutions which were considered potential sites. This list was based on the following considerations:

A. Geographical location;

B. Previously stated interest in CUTE activities;

C. Knowledge of institutions which were already active in urban education;

D. Major institutions located near metropolitan centers.

The 40 institutions were contacted by McREL to determine their interest in the project. Thirteen institutions reflected sufficient commitment to justify a meeting of their representatives in Kansas City. From this group, the following eight institutions were selected as diffusion sites for the CUTE program:

A. Louisville Urban Education Center in Louisville, Kentucky

B. Memphis State University in Memphis, Tennessee

C. Education Service Center in San Antonio, Texas

D. Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, Virginia

E. Chicago State University in Chicago, Illinois, with additional CUTE office in Posen-Robbins, Illinois

F. Tufts University in Boston, Massachusetts

G. University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

H. Michigan State University* in East Lansing and associated with the Service Center in Saginaw, Michigan

Instructional staff members from these institutions were brought to Kansas City for a staff installation workshop to prepare them for implementation of the program. In this workshop, held August 14-21, 1972, it was intended that participants would:

A. Become acquainted with the three components (sociological, psychological and educational), goals, methods, strategies and activities of the CUTE program;

---

*Michigan State did not become an official CUTE installation site until the second semester of the 1972-73 school year. A site in addition to the original seven above had been selected by McREL to initiate a CUTE program fall semester, 1973, but failure of a school levy forced cancellation of the program in late summer. By that time, it was too late for another site to plan the implementation of a CUTE program for the fall semester. Thus, only seven sites were in operation the first semester of the 1972-73 school year. Michigan State became the eighth officially funded installation site in January, 1973.

B. Participate in selected sociological, educational and psychological activities CUTE student teachers experience, which are considered of prime importance in the CUTE training program;

C. Construct a detailed flexible plan for implementation at particular sites, using the tested experiences and materials enumerated in the CUTE Manual as a base.

Daily reactions were obtained from the participants regarding individual workshop sessions. The participants rendered very positive impressions of the workshop training. For instance, based on an analysis of individual sessions, approximately 90 percent of those in attendance "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the workshop sessions were worthwhile. Ninety-five percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the content of the sessions was easily understood. And 91 percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed" the objectives of the sessions were relevant to the general objectives of the workshop (how to install a CUTE program). Similar statistics obtained for 14 other categories of response confirmed the respondents' contention the workshop was a worthwhile training experience.

At the end of the workshop, each site team was required to submit a plan for installing a CUTE program at their site. The installation plan entailed a scope-and-sequence academic calendar for a CUTE program for the coming semester. Individual topics to be discussed in each of the three components each day during the eight weeks of seminars were identified. The installation plans were reviewed individually by the workshop staff with each site team,

and suggestions and recommendations were made. After the workshop, the site plans were also rated by the workshop staff on 11 different dimensions.

Participants were also asked to keep daily logs during the workshop. Personal impressions obtained of the various workshop activities again revealed the training was viewed as a profitable experience by the participants. The awareness session, the field experience in the inner city and the live-in with an inner-city family were some experiences particularly favored by the participants.

Thus, based on the evaluation data collected, the CUTE Installation Workshop was deemed a success. However, the real proof of a staff's ability to implement a CUTE program could only be gained by the performance of the installation staffs at their home sites. McREL monitors were dispatched to the sites to observe, evaluate and offer appropriate recommendations.

During the 1972-73 academic year, McREL utilized three staff members, all part of the CUTE developmental team, to monitor diffusion sites and render technical assistance as needed. Three visits were made to each site. Discussions with CUTE students and CUTE staff, tours of the local inner-city community, meetings with local school personnel and participation in student seminars were typical activities in which monitors engaged.

EVALUATION

The focus of the evaluation for the CUTE Diffusion Project was twofold:

A. To determine if the project was accomplishing its stated

goal--i.e., if the CUTE program was being implemented properly at the eight installation sites; and

B. To assess if there were ongoing operational problems or weaknesses at each of the sites during the year so as to rectify them immediately and thereby preserve the success of the program.

A formative or process evaluation plan was developed to accomplish this purpose. The design entailed both the administration of tests to the students at the CUTE installation sites and ratings of the sites by McREL monitors on program characteristics essential to the proper implementation of CUTE.

The monitor reports reflected considerable evidence the eight sites implemented the program with a high degree of success. Three types of reports were generated from the on-site visits:

A. Responses to a form reporting individual interviews with the site directors;

B. Responses to an evaluation checklist; and

C. Narrative summaries reporting activities in which the monitors engaged at the site, strengths and weaknesses of the site and the monitor's recommendations.

Blank copies of monitor forms are included in Appendix A.

At the final evaluation on-site visit, six of the eight sites received above-average ratings (4 or 5) on 90 percent of the 19 items on the rating form. The average rating for all sites on all items was above-average and the highest ratings related to students' positive attitudes and to staff attitudes toward the CUTE program.

As a further means of assessing the effectiveness of sites involved in the CUTE diffusion effort, tests were administered to students at the CUTE installation sites during the 1972 fall semester. CUTE students completed the following instruments:

A. Cultural Attitude Inventory (CAI)

B. Teaching Situation Reaction Test (TSRT)

C. Semantic Differential

D. Personal Orientation Inventory (POI)

The instruments were administered at three testing times during the fall semester: Time 1, at the beginning of the semester; Time 2, after the first eight weeks of seminars; and Time 3, at the end of the semester, at the conclusion of the student teaching period.

Results of the testing were favorable. Increases in mean scores from pre- to posttests were found for a sizable majority of the variables investigated. The analysis revealed statistically significant increases for one-third of the variables. The mean scores on these tests for students in the diffusion sites were quite similar to the earlier scores of students trained at developmental sites in Kansas City, Wichita, and Oklahoma City. The similarity between the two groups is perhaps the most important finding, since it indicates diffusion sites produced students with characteristics similar to those who successfully completed CUTE training at the original sites. Thus, on the basis of monitor evaluations and testing results, it is apparent the Phase I diffusion effort was successful.

SUMMARY OF PHASE II DIFFUSION PROJECT

OBJECTIVES

In June, 1973, McREL received official notice from the National Institute of Education, into which the National Center for Educational Communication had been subsumed, that the CUTE Diffusion Project was being continued for a second year. The funding period for the new grant was August 1, 1973-July 31, 1974. The Phase II strategy for the CUTE diffusion effort in 1973-74 was the establishment of three regional training centers and five CUTE consortia sites.

Objectives of the project were delineated as follows:

A. Work unit objectives for sites establishing a CUTE consortia:

1. To identify and select institutions within the respective regions interested in establishing a CUTE program;
2. To establish an advisory committee comprised of representatives from participating institutions to coordinate consortium activities;
3. To provide opportunities to acquaint faculty members from participating institutions with CUTE objectives and training techniques;
4. To inform prospective students from consortium institutions of the philosphy and objectives of CUTE;
5. To continue operation of the ongoing CUTE programs at the five original sites at the same or an increased level of participation over that of 1972-73.

B. Work unit objectives for Regional Training Centers:

1. To identify and select subsidiary installation sites interested in implementing the CUTE program;
2. To train instructional staffs from the subsidiary installation sites to implement the CUTE program;
3. To monitor and provide technical assistance to the subsidiary sites;
4. To continue the ongoing operation of the CUTE program at the three Regional Training Centers at the same or an increased level over 1972-73.

PROCEDURES

The regional training centers and consortia sites were chosen from among the sites established through the first-year grant for 1972-73. Site needs, desires, capabilities and location were analyzed carefully by McREL in selecting and designating each of the eight original sites according to the two new classifications of sites for the 1973-74 project. A meeting of CUTE site directors and deans from the participating institutions was held at McREL in June, 1973. The purpose of the meeting was twofold: 1) to review operation of the CUTE program at the various sites for the first year; and 2) to discuss the interests of the individual sites in becoming regional training centers or consortia sites. Much was gained from the meeting in regard to project direction and allocation of the funds obtained. Sites were requested to submit proposals to McREL, and on the basis of these the following sites were selected to serve in the capacities indicated:

Regional Training Centers

Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee
Tufts University, Boston, Massachusetts

Consortia Sites

Louisville Urban Education Center in cooperation with the University of Louisville and University of Kentucky, Louisville, Kentucky
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee
Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia
Michigan State University, Saginaw-Bay Area Center, Saginaw, Michigan

The Education Service Center in San Antonio, Texas, was unable to continue its CUTE program in 1973-74. In order to continue program efforts in the Texas region, SWREL selected Texas Southern University in Houston to operate as a CUTE consortia site through the second-year grant. The decision for their participation was made in late fall, 1973. Soon after, staff were selected and trained and implementation of the program began in the 1974 spring semester.

Scope-of-Work Activities of Sites

The next step in the project was for the funded institutions to begin carrying out their scope-of-work activities. A major activity was to contact other universities or colleges in their region regarding their potential involvement in the CUTE program. All the while, the eight funded sites were operating CUTE programs of their own. Throughout the 1973-74 school year, consortia site staff members conducted "CUTE awareness" activities through phone calls, letters and on-site visits. Objectives and procedures in the CUTE program were explained to both faculties and students of "neighboring" institutions in the various regions of the consortia sites. Institutions

which were contacted and which participated in CUTE activities to some extent with consortia sites for the first time in 1973-74 were the following:

Institution	Consortia Site
Virginia Union University Virginia State College	Virginia Commonwealth University
Murray State University Spalding College	Louisville Urban Education Center
Central Michigan University	Michigan State University
Dominican College University of St. Thomas	Texas Southern University

In all but one of these instances, at least some students from the new participating institutions were trained in the CUTE concept.

It is interesting to note that Texas Southern, a predominately black institution, formed a consortium with two private, predominately white institutions in Houston, Dominican College and the University of St. Thomas. Thus, an offshoot of the CUTE diffusion effort was a relatively unusal and presumably meritorious relationship: a multiethnic consortium involving southern educational institutions.

Due to various reasons, primarily institutional restrictions, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee could not establish a CUTE consortium in their region. Hence, though originally planned, no funds were allocated to UMW in 1973-74; however, the CUTE program at UMW continued to operate with a high degree of effectiveness.

The three regional training centers--at Boston, Chicago and Memphis--had a different task. Their job was to select four teacher education institutions in their region and to train their staffs to implement a CUTE program independently during the 1974 spring semester. The site directors from Tufts University, Chicago State University and Memphis State University sent out many letters of invitation to universities and colleges requesting mini-proposals regarding their potential involvement in the CUTE diffusion effort. After spending several months during the summer and fall of 1973 on recruitment and on consideration of the responses received, the CUTE director and appropriate administrators at each of the regional training centers selected four new subsidiary CUTE sites within their regions. Site selection was based on the following criteria:

A. Demonstrated need for the program;

B. Commitment of the installation site, including commitment of local funds to the adoption process and the willingness to make an allocation of qualified staff to the program;

C. Availability of qualified local staff members, including a sociologist, a mental health specialist and one or more teacher educators;

D. Willingness of the inner-city population to participate in the program;

E. Specification of the number of student teachers to be reached by the installer teams.

The following 12 new sites were selected:

Boston Region

Westfield State College, Springfield, Massachusetts
Worcester State College, Worcester, Massachusetts
Boston State College, Boston, Massachusetts
Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven, Connecticut

Chicago Region

Indiana University at Fort Wayne
Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, Indiana
Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio
San Francisco State University, San Francisco, California

Memphis Region

Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida
University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana

Each of these sites began implementing a CUTE program during the 1974 spring semester.

Training Workshops

Five-day workshops were conducted at each of the regional training centers to prepare instructional staff members from the new subsidiary sites for implementation of the CUTE program. CUTE Installation Workshops were held at Chicago in November, 1973; Memphis in December, 1973; and Boston in January, 1974. Basically, objectives and techniques of the program were discussed in detail during the workshop. Participants also engaged in selected sociological field experiences pertinent to CUTE. According to their required scope of work, regional sites were required to incorporate the following training experiences in their CUTE workshops:

A. Familiarization with the CUTE curriculum, with particular attention given to the relationships among the sociology, mental health and teacher education components;

B. A "live-in" with an inner-city family, or alternative experience involving awareness of the local inner-city community;

C. Presentation by regional CUTE staff of significant adaptation problems;

D. During the latter portion of the training session, development by each subsidiary site installation team of its own work plan and schedule for implementation of CUTE at its home site.

A training package prepared by McREL project staff was provided to each of the regional centers prior to their workshops. The package consisted of a five-day schedule of workshop activities and objectives and numerous handouts--some for seminars in each of the three program components of CUTE. Though some modifications were made in the schedule and not all materials were used, each of the regional sites conducted workshops according to the general guidelines recommended by McREL.

At the end of the workshop, in addition to submitting installation plans (scope-and-sequence calendars) for their semester-long CUTE program, participants were asked to complete a McREL questionnaire--rating scale on their evaluation of the effectiveness of the training provided. Responses to

these questions were very favorable. Ratings on a 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) scale were almost always above-average on various characteristics of both the performance of the workshop staff and the content of the presentations. A copy of the Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

Enrollment

The number of CUTE students enrolled at each of the 20 CUTE diffusion sites during the 1973-74 school year is reported in Table 1. Also listed are grand totals of CUTE students graduated at the earlier sites in Kansas City, Wichita, Oklahoma City and Omaha, as well as the number of CUTE graduates at the diffusion sites in 1972-73. It should be noted these totals not only indicate the widespread diffusion of an educational program but also significant program output considering the limited amount of funding the CUTE effort has received over the years.

TABLE 1

CUTE INSTALLATION SITES--STUDENT ENROLLMENT 1973-74

NAME OF SITE	NO. STUDENTS SPRING, 1974	NO. STUDENTS FALL, 1973
BOSTON	12	10
Southern Connecticut State	80	
Boston State College	9	
Westfield State College	12	
Worcester State College		
MEMPHIS	13	17
University of Miami	14	
Florida State University	14	
Grambling College	20	
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa	15	
LOUISVILLE	16	14
CHICAGO	14	24
Central State University	16	
San Francisco State University	25	
Indiana University-Fort Wayne	17	
Indiana University-Purdue University	20	
TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	11	
MILWAUKEE (unfunded)	23	23
RICHMOND	10	10
MICHIGAN STATE	15	
	356	98

NUMBER OF GRADUATES OF ALL CUTE PROGRAMS AS OF END OF SPRING SEMESTER, 1974

Kansas City CUTE	364	Omaha CUTE	181
Wichita CUTE	362	8 Diffusion Sites (1972-73)	307
Oklahoma City CUTE (terminated Spring 1973)	208	20 Diffusion Sites (1973-74)	454

TOTAL 1,876

The remaining activities of the 1973-74 CUTE diffusion effort consisted primarily of on-site visits to the CUTE sites by either McREL personnel or regional site staff members. These will be discussed in detail in the Evaluation section of this report. Another type of project activity of consequence during the year was the work of McREL with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education of (AACTE). The nature of the project activities conducted with AACTE is discussed next.

Involvement With AACTE

Through the CUTE diffusion effort, McREL has established a close working relationship with the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). McREL has been involved with AACTE over the past year in three ways:

A. Publication of a national newsletter on CUTE;

B. Presentation at the AACTE annual meeting; and

C. Conducting four one-day conferences on CUTE throughout the country during the year.

All three activities served an important role in the overall CUTE diffusion strategy for 1973-74. Four issues of the newsletter, entitled TARGET, were published over the last 12 months. Various project news was discussed in each issue. More than 9,000 copies of each edition were mailed; addresses included all member institutions of AACTE and persons and organizations on the McREL mailing list. Secondly, Grant Clothier, project director at McREL and William Young, dean of the School of Education at Chicago State University, chaired a session on CUTE at the AACTE annual convention in Chicago in February.

Third, one-day "drive-in" conferences were held on the CUTE program at San Francisco and each one of the regional training centers. Letters of invitation were sent from AACTE to teacher education institutions in the immediate region.

These drive-in conferences proved to be quite useful as an awareness mechanism. Conferences were held at Tufts University in Boston in November, 1973; San Francisco State University in February, 1974; Memphis State University in March, 1974; and Chicago State University in April, 1974. In each instance the local CUTE director organized and presided over conference activities. At least one representative from McREL and one from AACTE also attended. CUTE objectives and procedures were discussed briefly, sometimes through the use of slides or sound-filmstrips. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of the conference, and again, responses were very positive. Unfortunately, no one at the Boston conference and not everyone present at the other three conferences completed the instrument. Nevertheless, virtually all those responding indicated that the institute was a worthwhile experience, that there is a need for a special teacher education program like CUTE, and that the CUTE program was explained adequately to them. Twenty-three of 25 persons felt that the CUTE program has the proper elements of a teacher education program to effectively prepare inner-city teachers, and 17 of 19 persons responding indicated they developed an interest in the CUTE program as a result of the drive-in conference. (See the table in Appendix C.)

Many educators and other professional personnel who would not have been reached otherwise were contacted regarding the CUTE program through these activities with AACTE.

Memphis State CUTE Workshop

The final major activity of the 1973-74 CUTE diffusion effort was another CUTE Installation Workshop which was held at Memphis State University June 10-14. The workshop was open to anyone interested in learning about or possibly installing a CUTE program. According to John Soptick, McREL representative in attendance, it was a most successful conference.

Representatives from ten teacher education institutions attended the workshop. Colleges or universities represented were the University of Alabama-Huntsville; the University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa; Mansfield State College, Mansfield, Pennsylvania; Southwestern University, Memphis, Tennessee; Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana; Lesley College, Cambridge, Massachusetts; East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas; Dillard University, New Orleans, Louisiana; Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Missouri; and Chicago State University, Chicago, Illinois.

Paul Jones, CUTE site director at Memphis State University, directed the conference. Dr. Jones was ably assisted by other members of his CUTE staff: Pat Boyne Coats, Education Specialist, Janet Henson, Mental Health Specialist and Arnold Parks, Sociologist, in guiding the participants through relevant training experiences. Seminars focused on objectives, procedures and techniques

for each of the three components of the CUTE program. Field experiences in the city consumed a substantial segment of the participants' time; included was a modified "live-in" consisting of a half-day visit with a family in a low-income area.

The workshop participants were a very responsive group, eager to contribute to discussions and quite interested in the CUTE program. It is felt almost all of the participants will work either to establish a CUTE program at their institution or at least incorporate some aspects of CUTE into their ongoing teacher education programs.

EVALUATION

The objectives of the evaluation plan for the 1973-74 CUTE diffusion Project were:

A. To test the ability of three selected sites to serve as regional training centers for the CUTE program;
B. To test the ability of five other sites to diffuse the CUTE program through the establishment of CUTE consortia; and
C. To determine if the CUTE program was being implemented properly both at the original diffusion sites and at the new installation sites throughout the year.

In accord with these goals, three types of evaluation data were collected:

A. Progress reports from all individual sites;
B. Monitors' reports based on personal visits to the sites; and
C. Testing of CUTE students enrolled at the sites during the 1974 spring semester.

The purpose of collecting the evaluation data was to provide documentation that the diffusion sites were accomplishing what they were contracted to do, thereby validating attainment of project goals. The purpose of the individual reports from sites was to have the CUTE directors respond on their progress to date in regard to scope-of-work activities delineated in their Letters of Agreement with McREL. The original seven sites, including Texas Southern University, were required to submit three technical progress reports and one final report to McREL. The subsidiary sites were required to submit one technical progress report and one final report to their regional training center with a copy to McREL. The progress reports submitted were quite good and provided McREL and, in turn, NIE with very helpful information regarding the current status of program activities at each CUTE site. Reports indicated site staffs were in fact undertaking scope-of-work activities conducive to accomplishment of CUTE objectives.

Monitors' Reports

Monitors were used to determine if project activities were being carried out properly and, if necessary, to provide technical assistance in the form of suggestions and/or materials. Site activities investigated by the monitors involved proper implementation of the CUTE program and designated scope-of-work activities. Although Grant Clothier made some on-site visits, Manouchehr Pedram was the primary monitor from McREL. Dr. Pedram visited all but five of the 20 diffusion sites during the 1973-74 school year. In addition, CUTE staff members from the regional training centers visited each of the CUTE subsidiary sites twice during the 1974 spring semester. Discussions with CUTE

students and CUTE faculty members, visits to the local inner-city community, meetings with local administrators, and attending student seminars were typical activities in which the monitors engaged during his/her on-site visit.

McREL monitors generated two kinds of reports: responses to an Evaluation Checklist, and a subjective narrative summary of the visit. The narrative summary included a report of on-site activities in which the monitor engaged, strengths and weaknesses of the particular site, and the monitor's recommendations. Regional training center monitors also completed the same two kinds of reports mentioned above and, in addition, completed rather lengthy interview schedules with the site directors. Blank copies of monitor forms used by the regional monitors are included in Appendix A (these were the same forms that were used in 1972-73). A copy of the Evaluation Checklist used by the McREL monitor in 1973-74 is included in Appendix D.

Monitors' average ratings, based on all sites visited during the 1973-74 school year, on 23 items on the Evaluation Checklist appear in Table 2. These items represent program characteristics essential to the proper implementation of CUTE. Ratings were based on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest possible rating given.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF MONITORS' RATINGS
OF CUTE INSTALLATION SITES, 1973-74

Average Ratings On An Evaluation Checklist Item	Average Rating* Per Item
1. An advisory committee is and has been involved in planning the CUTE program.	3.4
2. Every component of the program relates to the overall goal of training students to teach in the inner city.	4.3
3. All components of the program are moving toward specific objectives.	4.1
4. This program should accomplish the objectives delineated in the CUTE Manual.	4.1
5. The inner-city community (outside of the schools) is involved in the operation of this CUTE program.	3.5
6. The program provides for flexibility.	4.1
7. The staff is following the installation plan submitted.	4.0
8. There is good cooperation among the staff from all three disciplines.	4.6
9. The staff is fulfilling its duties and responsibilities to the program.	4.3
10. Facilities are adequate for conducting the CUTE program.	4.6
11. The staff members are following the CUTE Manual.	3.7
12. The program director's role is clearly defined.	4.7
13. Program personnel roles are clearly defined.	4.6
14. The program staff have a clear understanding of the educational objectives of the CUTE program.	4.5
15. The members of the staff are implementing these objectives in terms of activities.	4.1
16. Plans for evaluating students have been made.	4.5
17. An open and honest relationship exists between students and staff.	4.7
18. An open and honest relationship exists among the students themselves.	4.7
19. Students are reacting positively and enthusiastically to the CUTE program at this site.	4.6
20. Staff members are doing an adequate job of teaching the CUTE students.	4.2
21. Techniques of reflective inquiry are being utilized in student seminars.	4.3
22. Worthwhile field experiences are being planned or undertaken by CUTE students.	3.8
23. Students have an opportunity to ventillate their fears, concerns and complaints at this site.	4.3

*1 = Lowest Rating ("to no extent"); 5 = Highest Rating ("to the greatest extent")

The results are, indeed, encouraging. The great majority of ratings assigned were above average (ratings of 4 or 5). Ratings were particularly high on the following program characteristics:

A. Good cooperation among all members of the staff
B. Adequacy of facilities for conducting the CUTE program
C. Clear definition of program director's role
D. Clear definition of program personnel roles
E. Staffs' understanding of the CUTE objectives
F. Provision of plans for evaluating students
G. Open and honest relationship between students and staff
H. Open and honest relationship among the students themselves
I. Positive and enthusiastic reaction of students toward the CUTE program.

Average ratings from the monitors were at least 4.5 for the nine items listed above.

The monitors' responses on the Evaluation Checklist provide documentation that the CUTE diffusion sites of 1973-74 have done an excellent job implementing the CUTE program. These data are perhaps the most important data collected because they were obtained directly (from on-site visits) by monitors very experienced in the CUTE program. Particularly encouraging are the open and honest interpersonal relationships exhibited at the sites and the positive and enthusiastic reaction of students toward the CUTE program.

Testing of CUTE Students

As a further means of assessing the effectiveness of this year's project efforts, two tests were administered to students at the CUTE installation sites

during the 1974 spring semester. The instruments were administered on a pre-test-posttest basis, once at the beginning of the semester and once at the end of the semester. The two instruments administered to the CUTE students were the CUTE Quiz and the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). A brief description of each of these instruments follows.

The CUTE Quiz. The CUTE Quiz is an instrument developed by John Soptick, research and evaluation specialist for the diffusion project at McREL. It was designed to test student mastery of some major concepts and goals of the teacher education and sociology components of the CUTE program. There are 50 items on the test--17 in the Education section and 33 in the Sociology section. Some items are cognitive, others are affective. Most items are to be answered either "Agree" or "Disagree." Two points are awarded for a correct response, so that the perfect score on the instrument is 100. This test is based on two reference sources:

A. The CUTE Manual and

B. The Disadvantaged Child, a book of readings edited by Joe L. Frost and Glenn R. Hawkes and published by the Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1966.

The items on this test reflect the kinds of knowledge or attitudes students should gain by advancing through the CUTE program. Items based on articles in the latter text represent information that students should be able to gain through any number of sociology texts or references and/or through field experiences in the inner city. The CUTE Quiz was developed in the fall of 1973 and utilized for the first time during the 1974 spring semester. Up to this time no data on test validity and reliability exist for this instrument. The CUTE Quiz should be considered in a developmental stage.

The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The Personal Orientation Inventory is a standardized psychological inventory which assesses the degree to which one can be classified as a "self-actualized" person. The instrument is based on psychologist Abraham Maslow's concept of the self-actualizing person who is seen as utilizing all of his unique capabilities and is free of inhibitions, thereby living a more enriched life than the average person. The inventory consists of 150 two-choice, mutually exclusive, value and behavior judgments. POI items are purported to be non-threatening to examinees. Fourteen sub-scales and two ratio scores are delineated for the inventory:

Time Incompentence (T_I) - The time incompetent person lives primarily in the past, with guilts and resentments, and/or in the future, with idealized goals, expectations and fears.

Time Competence (T_C) - The time competent person lives primarily in the present, less burdened by guilts and with full awareness and ability to tie the past and the future meaningfully to present working goals.

Time Ratio (T_I/T_C) - Degree to which one is "present-oriented."

Other Directedness (O) - Degree to which an individual's mode of reaction is oriented toward others.

Inner Directedness (I) - Degree to which an individual's mode of reaction is oriented toward his or herself.

Support Ratio (O/I) - Degree to which reactivity orientation is basically toward others or self.

Self-Actualizing Value - Degree to which an individual holds and lives by values of self-actualizing people.

Existentiality - Degree of one's flexibility in applying self-actualizing values or principles to one's life.

Feeling Reactivity - Degree of sensitivity to one's own needs and feelings.

Spontaneity - Ability to react spontaneously or to be oneself.

Self-Regard - Ability to like oneself because of one's strength as a person.

Self-Acceptance - Acceptance of oneself in spite of one's weaknesses or deficiencies.

Nature of Man - Degree to which one sees man as essentially good.

Synergy - Ability to see opposites of life (such as work and play or selfishness and selflessness) as being meaningfully related.

Acceptance of Aggression - Ability to accept anger or aggression within oneself as natural.

Capacity for Intimate Contact - Ability to develop meaningful, physical relationships with other human beings.[1]

The reason this instrument was selected to help evaluate program effectiveness of CUTE is that the CUTE program has a substantive component in mental health. The POI is intended to provide an objective delineation of the level of a person's mental health. One purpose of CUTE is to help students become more open and honest, emotionally mature and more aware of themselves, their strengths and weaknesses, fears and anxieties. In other words, one goal of the CUTE program is to help the student teacher to become better psychologically adjusted. Hence, the POI is an appropriate instrument to use to evaluate CUTE, particularly such sub-scales as Self-Regard and Self-Acceptance, which relate to self-concept.

The author of this inventory is Everett L. Shostrom, director of the Institute of Therapeutic Psychology, Santa Anna, California. A test manual providing a thorough explanation of the POI, test booklets, answer sheets and other attendant materials can be obtained from:

Educational and Industrial Testing Service
P. O. Box 7234
San Diego, California 92107

[1]Shostrom, Everett L. Personal Orientation Inventory Manual. Educational and Industrial Testing Service, San Diego, CA., 1966, pp. 5, 6, 15, 20, 21.

Analysis. Means and standard deviations for both the pretest and posttest were computed for the total group of CUTE students participating in the testing. Means are based only on scores of students who completed both testings. Two-tailed student standardized t-tests were also calculated to test the significance of difference between pre- and posttest means. A total of 119 students, representing 10 sites, completed and returned answer sheets for both the pretest and posttest. Three other sites returned answer sheets to McREL for one or both of the instruments for the pretesting only; one other site returned posttest answer sheets, but no pretests. Data from these latter four sites which reported scores from only one testing were not included in the analysis recorded in this report. Test statistics for the 119 CUTE students on sub-scales for both the CUTE Quiz and the Personal Orientation Inventory are reported in Tables 3 and 4.

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF PRE- AND POSTTEST RESULTS

CUTE QUIZ

Total Group of CUTE Students Participating - Spring Semester 1974
N = 119

MEAN SCORES AND STUDENT t-TESTS

		$\bar{X}$	s.d.	t
EDUCATION - Number Right (Perfect Score: 17)	pre-	12.08	1.87	4.75****
	post-	12.97	1.86	
SOCIOLOGY - Number Right (Perfect Score: 33)	pre-	21.69	3.68	2.93***
	post-	22.61	3.54	
TOTAL SCORE (Perfect Score: 100)	pre-	67.55	9.24	4.73****
	post-	71.21	8.95	

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .025 level
***Significant at .01 level
****Significant at .001 level (or greater significance)
No asterisk (*) means no significance

NOTE: Means are based only on scores of students who participated in both testings.

A positive t indicates an increase in mean score from pretest to posttest; a negative t indicates a decrease in mean score.

s.d. = standard deviation

(The remarks noted above also apply to Table 4)

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF PRE- AND POSTTEST RESULTS
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY (POI)

Total Group of CUTE Students Participating - Spring Semester 1974

MEAN SCORES, STUDENT t-TESTS, AND COMPARATIVE DATA

SUB-SCALES		Students, CUTE Diffusion Sites N = 119 $\bar{X}$	s.d.	t	Comparative Data: Previous CUTE Students N = 67 $\bar{X}$	Self-Actualized Group+ N = 29 $\bar{X}$	Normal Adult Group+ N = 158 $\bar{X}$
T_I = Time Incompetence	pre-	5.76	3.08	-1.67		3.72	5.06
	post-	5.34	2.69				
T_C = Time Competence	pre-	16.94	2.97	* 2.01		18.93	17.70
	post-	17.46	2.69				
O = Other Directedness	pre-	40.72	10.47	**** -4.29		31.13	37.35
	post-	37.70	10.45				
I = Inner Directedness	pre-	84.16	10.28	**** 5.53		92.86	87.25
	post-	88.10	10.11				
SAV= Self-Actualizing Value	pre-	19.69	2.49	**** 3.65	19.82	20.69	20.17
	post-	20.79	2.32		20.49		
Ex = Existentiality	pre-	20.11	4.86	*** 3.02	20.75	24.76	21.80
	post-	21.18	4.73		22.25		
Fr = Feeling Reactivity	pre-	15.38	2.69	**** 3.44	15.36	16.28	15.74
	post-	16.22	2.60		16.30		
S = Spontaneity	pre-	12.15	2.45	** 2.49	11.94	12.66	11.65
	post-	12.71	2.28		12.52		
Sr = Self-Regard	pre-	12.70	1.96	1.68	11.96	12.90	11.97
	post-	13.01	1.80		12.55		
Sa - Self-Acceptance	pre-	15.61	3.34	**** 3.65	15.87	18.93	17.09
	post-	16.66	3.93		16.82		
Nc = Nature of Man, Constructive	pre-	11.82	1.91	.84	11.83	12.34	12.37
	post-	11.97	2.15		12.40		
Sy = Synergy	pre-	6.99	1.31	1.63	7.06	7.62	7.32
	post-	7.19	1.28		7.40		
A = Acceptance of Aggression	pre-	16.05	2.87	**** 4.56	16.42	17.62	16.63
	post-	17.04	2.84		17.57		
C = Capacity for Intimate Contact	pre-	18.52	3.53	**** 4.44	18.08	20.21	18.80
	post-	19.76	3.28		19.66		
RATIO SCORES: T_I/T_C	pre-	.39	.31	* -2.00	.38		
	post-	.34	.23		.35		
T_C/T_I	pre-	4.47	3.94	1.00		7.69	5.10
	post-	4.85	4.41				
O/I	pre-	.51	.20	**** -4.55	.53		
	post-	.45	.18		.45		
I/O	pre-	2.28	.91	**** 4.57		3.28	2.50
	post-	2.63	1.14				

+Data taken from Table 5, p. 26, POI Manual, Everett L. Shostrom, Educational and Industrial Testing Service, San Diego, California

*Significant at .05 level **Significant at .025 level ***Significant at .01 level ****Significant at .001 level (or greater significance)
No asterisk (*) means no significance

Results. Test results for the total group were most encouraging. As noted in Table 3, highly significant differences in a positive direction were obtained when comparing pretest with posttest means on the Education section, the Sociology section, and the Total Score on the CUTE Quiz. The difference in mean scores for the Sociology section was at the .01 level of significance; the gains in mean scores from pretest to posttest for the other two scales on the instrument were at the .001 level of significance. These results are particularly impressive because the CUTE Quiz was designed specifically to measure CUTE objectives. All items in the Education section, for instance, were based on statements taken directly from the CUTE Manual. Since the Manual delineates the major concepts upon which the program is based, these particular statistical findings are quite important.

Findings on the second instrument, the POI, were just as favorable. Pretest-posttest gains were statistically significant, at various α levels, on 9 of 14 sub-scales of the test.* As compared with the data on previous CUTE students listed in the third column from the right in Table 4, results are again quite positive. Mean scores of the students at diffusion sites in 1973-74 compare very closely with mean scores for CUTE students at the earlier established sites in Kansas City, Oklahoma City and Wichita. This

*There was a significant difference at the .001 level on one other sub-scale, "Other Directedness," but the difference was in a negative direction. However, this was a desirable result. For, according to the POI Test Manual, the self-actualized person is considerably more inner-directed than other-directed. Hence, it is desirable for the mean score on the Other Directedness scale to decrease from pretest to posttest, and the mean on the Inner Directedness scale to increase from pretest to posttest. (These two scales are complementary.) For similar reasons, decreases in mean scores and hence negative t's are desirable on the following additional variables: T_I, T_I/T_C, and O/I.

result alone confirms the success of this year's project because the CUTE programs had been conducted by experienced CUTE staff and had been a success.

Finally, the 1973-74 CUTE students compare favorably with Maslow's criterion group of self-actualized persons. This result can be observed by comparing the data for the self-actualized group in the second column from the right in Table 4 with posttest means for the 1973-74 CUTE students. In almost all cases, the posttest means are (slightly) greater than the means for the normal adult group listed in the far right column in the table. Moreover, the means for the CUTE students are greater than the corresponding means for the self-actualized group on the following variables: Self-Regard, Spontaneity and Self-Actualizing Values. Also, the posttest mean on the Feeling Reactivity sub-scale for the CUTE group is almost as high (a difference of .03) as the mean for the self-actualized group. Particularly encouraging is the fact the posttest mean for the CUTE students on the variable Self-Regard is 13.01, and the corresponding mean for the self-actualized group is only 12.90. To find that the CUTE students at these recent diffusion sites resemble such an esoteric criterion group as self-actualizing persons on several important variables is, indeed, a significant result.

In summary, data from three sources--individual site reports, monitor reports and ratings, and test data--confirm the success of the Phase II CUTE diffusion effort. The research evidence indicates the diffusion sites participating in the project in 1973-74 did an excellent job implementing the CUTE program.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CUTE DIFFUSION PROJECT 1973-74

McREL project staff offer the following as the major accomplishments of the CUTE diffusion effort in 1973-74:

A. Conclusive demonstration that the CUTE program is fully transportable, as shown by the successful activities of the Regional Training Centers;

B. Demonstration that competent instructional staff teams can take staff training materials from an original developer and train other staff teams in the objectives and procedures of an educational program (referring to the successful implementation of CUTE Installation Workshops at the regional training centers);

C. Addition of 12 new CUTE installation sites;

D. Establishment of four CUTE consortia sites, involving a total of seven new participating institutions;

E. Affirmed institutionalization of CUTE as an alternative teacher education program at a minimum of six original sites;

F. Preliminary indication that subsidiary sites will continue to implement the CUTE concept at their own expense in the future;

G. Dissemination of initial information on CUTE to approximately 100 teacher education institutions across the country in 1973-74;

H. Periodic dissemination of information on CUTE and CUTE diffusion to approximately 9,000 educators through the TARGET, the McREL/AACTE national newsletter on CUTE.

There is no doubt CUTE has become one of the most widely diffused educational programs in the country today, effecting noticeable benefits for urban education.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the success of the two-year CUTE Diffusion Project, recommendations are included in this final section of the report which are directed to agencies like NIE which may allocate funds for educational diffusion projects in the future.

A. Select well-designed programs that meet a critical need.

B. Select programs that have some degree of flexibility to permit potential diffusion sites to adapt programs to local needs.

C. Provide at least five months lead time for contacting potential installation sites, making agreements, preparing site personnel and recruiting participants.

D. Seek to insure the selections of site personnel who are committed to the installation and continued operation of the diffused program.

E. Provide support for comprehensive preparation of installation site personnel by program developers.

F. Provide adequate lead time for training installation site personnel prior to initiation of program operation.

G. Provide for adequate technical assistance through project monitors to insure replication of major aspects of the program being diffused.

H. Encourage the establishment of close working relationships with decision-makers (e.g., deans, superintendents) at each installation site.

I. Provide for time throughout the year for program development and coordinating staff to meet with installation site teams for purposes of program planning and exchange of ideas.

J. Maintain the Regional Training Center (CUTE Diffusion Phase II) concept for widespread diffusion capability of programs.

K. Increase funding level for Regional Training Center personnel to insure adequate monitoring and technical assistance at subsidiary sites.

APPENDIX A

MONITOR'S REPORT
Evaluation Checklist

Site Visited: _____ Date: _____

Monitor _____ Site Visit #1

Instructions: Upon completion of your site visit, based on your observations and interviews, respond to the following statements concerning the CUTE Program at the site you visited. Circle one response * for each item.

1.	An advisory committee is and has been involved in planning the CUTE Program.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
2.	Every component of the program relates to the overall goal of training students to teach in the inner city.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
3.	All components of the program are moving toward specific objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
4.	This program should accomplish the objectives delineated in the CUTE Manual.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
5.	The inner city community (outside of the schools) is involved in the operation of this CUTE Program.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
6.	The project provides for flexibility.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
7.	The staff is following the installation plan submitted.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
8.	There is good cooperation among the staff from all three disciplines.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
9.	The staff is fulfilling its duties and responsibilities to the project.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
10.	Facilities are adequate for conducting the CUTE Program.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
11.	The staff members are following the CUTE Manual.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
12.	The project director's role is clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
13.	Project personnel roles are clearly defined.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
14.	The project staff have a clear understanding of the educational objectives of the CUTE Program.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
15.	The members of the staff are implementing these objectives in terms of activities.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
16.	Plans for evaluating students have been made.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.

* See Below

17. An open and honest relationship exists between students and staff.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
18. An open and honest relationship exists among the students themselves.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
19. Students are reacting positively and enthusiastically to the CUTE Program at this site.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
20. Staff members are doing an adequate job of teaching the CUTE students.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
21. Techniques of reflective inquiry are being utilized in student seminars.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
22. Worthwhile field experiences are being planned or undertaken by CUTE students.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.
23. Students have an opportunity to ventillate their fears, concerns, and complaints at this site.	1	2	3	4	5	I.D.

* 1 = lowest rating ("to no extent")
  5 = highest rating ("to the greatest extent")
  I.D. = insufficient data

I. What was your assessment of the project <u>during your visit?</u>

_____ Effective in all phases
_____ Effective in most phases
_____ Limited effectiveness
_____ Ineffective

II. Based upon your observations and visits, how is the project now functioning when compared to your estimate of the status on basis of the original installation plan.

_____ Improved appreciably
_____ Some improvement observed
_____ No noticeable change
_____ Declined

State the basis for your estimate: _____

_____

III. Independent Observations: _____

_____

IV. General recommendations and/or suggestions: _____

_____

_____

MONITOR'S REPORT

Interview with Director

Site Visit No. 1 Date _____

Monitor: _____

Site: _____

Instructions to Monitor: Please complete this form while interviewing the director during your site visit. The items are intended to collect descriptive information and point to stages or procedures central to the proper installation of a CUTE program. Any advice you can give the director relative to any of the questions listed is clearly in order. Do not feel limited only to these items; if you feel other questions are important, ask them and record the director's responses on a separate sheet of paper.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. Organization, Administration

1. What institutions are participating in your CUTE program?

2. Is there an advisory committee for your CUTE program? If so, who is represented on it, how often does it meet, and what work has it done so far?

3. How were the following selected? What criteria were used, if any?

Staff:

Resource people:

Students:

Other:

4. How many students are enrolled in your program this semester?

5. Can you provide a list of your students with their academic majors and race indicated.

6. Where are your students housed?

7. What course credit arrangements have been made for the CUTE students?

8. What percent of their total professional time is each member of your staff required to devote to the CUTE program?

9. Are there any problems with financing any aspect of your program?

10. Are expenses being recorded?

11. How does the program relate to your inner-city community?

12. What kind of input has the community provided for your CUTE program? (e.g., members of the inner city on your advisory board?)

13. With what agencies in the inner city have you established relationships?

14. Have arrangements been made for the live-in? through contacts with one or more of these agencies?

15. Have arrangements been made for all field experiences to be conducted throughout the semester? through contacts with these agencies?

16. What contacts have you had with the schools in your inner city?

17. Have some arrangements been made for assigning your CUTE students to inner-city schools to do their student teaching?

18. Have cooperating teachers been selected for the student teaching? If so, what criteria were followed in the selection process?

19. Does the entire CUTE staff from all three components-education, sociology, and mental health--meet regularly?

20. To what extent is the CUTE Manual being followed?

21. What specific field experiences have taken place so far or are planned for the first three weeks?

22. To what extent is role-playing being used in the CUTE seminars?

23. Are students keeping daily logs?

24. Are there plans to use student evaluation forms provided in the CUTE Manual?

25. What other means of evaluating the students and/or the program are planned? (outside of the McREL evaluation)

26. Are occasional sessions planned in which students might ventillate their fears, problems, or complaints?

27. Is each member of the CUTE staff available outside of class at least once a week for private consultation with students?

28. What other materials or technical assistance do you need to fully implement the CUTE program?

29. What factors are deterring the effective installation of your CUTE program, if any?

MONITOR'S REPORT

Evaluation Checklist

Site Visited_____ Date_____

Monitor_____ Site Visit No. 2

Instructions: Upon completion of your site visit, based on your observations and interviews, respond to the following statements concerning the CUTE Program at the site you visited. Circle one response * for each item.

1.	Learning experiences previously planned for this CUTE program have been implemented	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
2.	This program should accomplish the objectives delineated in the CUTE Manual.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
3.	The inner city community (outside of the schools) is involved in the operation of this CUTE program.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
4.	The staff is following the installation plan submitted.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
5.	There is good cooperation among the staff from all three disciplines.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
6.	The staff is fulfilling its duties and responsibilities to the project.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
7.	The staff members are following the CUTE Manual.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
8.	Enough student seminars are being conducted,	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
9.	Appropriate seminars are being conducted at this time.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
10.	Plans for evaluating students have been made.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
11.	Monitor's recommendations from the previous site visit have been followed.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
12.	An open and honest relationship exists between students and staff.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
13.	An open and honest relationship exists among the students themselves.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.

*1 = lowest rating ("to no extent")
5 = highest rating ("to the greatest extent")

I.D. = insufficient data

14. Students are reacting positively and enthusiastically to the CUTE program at this site. 1 2 3 4 5 I.D.

15. Students have an opportunity to ventillate their fears, concerns, and complaints at this site. 1 2 3 4 5 I.D.

16. The overall reaction of the CUTE staff to the first eight weeks of the program is positive. 1 2 3 4 5 I.D.

I. What was your assessment of the project during your visit?

_____ Effective in all phases
_____ Effective in most phases
_____ Limited effectiveness
_____ Ineffective

II. Based upon your observations and visits, how is the project now functioning when compared to your estimate of the status on the basis of your first monitor visit?

_____ Improved appreciably
_____ Some improvement observed
_____ No noticeable change
_____ Declined

State the basis for your estimate (e.g., correction of previous weaknesses):

_____

_____

III. The cooperating teachers feel the CUTE student teachers are doing:

_____ Better _____ Worse _____About the same

as students they have supervised in the past.

Explain the student observing you did at this site (e.g., number of students observed, for what length of time, number of cooperating teachers with whom you talked.

IV. Describe the attitudes of the CUTE students at this site at this time (e.g., their commitment to the CUTE program and to inner-city teaching).

Describe the reactions of the CUTE students to the first eight weeks of their training program.

M O N I T O R ' s R E P O R T

Interview with Director

Site Visited: _____

DATE: _____ Monitor: _____

Site Visit No. 2

Instructions to Monitor: Please complete this form while interviewing the director during your site visit. The items are intended to collect descriptive information and point to stages or procedures central to the proper installation of a CUTE program. Any advice you can give the director relative to any of the questions listed is clearly in order. Do not feel limited to only these items; if you feel other questions are important, ask them and record the director's responses on another sheet of paper.

1. Have you carried out all aspects of the CUTE program you had previously planned? For example:

   a. Live-in

   b. Sociological field experiences

   c. Observations in schools

   d. Seminars in Teacher Education, Sociology, and Mental Health

2. Have you changed your CUTE program in any way to correct the weaknesses identified in the first monitor visit?

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

3. What relationship(s) does your CUTE program have now (during the student teaching period) with residents or agencies in the inner-city community?

4. What community activities are your CUTE students involved in during their student teaching?

5. Are the CUTE students presently working on any long-range projects or papers related to the inner-city community (such as an ethnographic study) which are due at the end of the semester? If so, what are they?

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

6. Are student seminars being held during the student teaching? How often and for what length of time?

7. What is the substance or focus of these seminars?

8. Are other informal sessions being held with your CUTE students?

9. Are individual oral conferences planned during the last two days of student teaching to evaluate the CUTE students?

10. Is your entire CUTE staff from all three components--teacher education, sociology, and mental health--continuing to meet regularly? How often do you meet?

STUDENT TEACHING

11. Are all of your CUTE students presently engaged in student teaching? If not, which ones are not and why not?

12. Are the cooperating teachers and/or CUTE faculty members (specify which) utilizing some objective instruments in observing the CUTE students during their student teaching? (For instance, forms in the CUTE Manual under EDU 103-4 and 104-6)

13. Has the MIA (McREL Interaction Analysis) system or the Flanders' system of interaction analysis been utilized?

MISCELLANEOUS

14. Have you or any other members of the CUTE staff made any contacts with the local school system or surrounding school systems with the purpose of arranging (or at least laying the groundwork for obtaining) teaching jobs for your CUTE students after they graduate?

15. Are you planning some farewell affair for the CUTE students at the end of the semester?

16. What difficulties have arisen in your CUTE program since the last monitor visit?

17. What other materials or technical assistance do you need to complete the implementation of the CUTE program?

18. After your experience up to this time with directing a CUTE program, what changes would you recommend in the CUTE program?

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE*

You are being asked to anonymously indicate your evaluation of this workshop experience. Please make ONE response for each item.

Instructor Characteristics:	HIGH		AVERAGE		LOW
1. Knowledge of the workshop content	5	4	3	2	1
2. Skill in teaching the content	5	4	3	2	1
3. Interest and enthusiasm for the content	5	4	3	2	1
4. Helpfulness to workshop participants	5	4	3	2	1
5. Tolerance of differing points of view	5	4	3	2	1
6. Sense of humor	5	4	3	2	1
7. Freedom from annoying mannerisms	5	4	3	2	1
Workshop Characteristics:					
8. Quality of the workshop experiences	5	4	3	2	1
9. Applicability of the workshop to you personally	5	4	3	2	1
10. Overall quality of the workshop in relation to comparable experiences	5	4	3	2	1

*Originally developed by the Midwest Center for Educational Opportunity, University of Missouri

11. Were the workshop objectives made clear?
Well Defined___ ___ ___ ___ ___Vague

12. I feel that the workshop objectives have been accomplished.
Fully___ ___ ___ ___ ___Not at all

13. The presentation mode of material rates:
High___ ___ ___ ___ ___Low

14. The assignments made in class (if any) were:
Clear___ ___ ___ ___ ___Vague ___No assignments made

15. The utilization of audio-visual media (if any) was:
Good___ ___ ___ ___ ___Poor ____No audio-visual media used

16. Do you feel the presenters provided enough time for questions and clarifying remarks?
Adequate___ ___ ___ ___ ___Inadequate

17. Was the pace of the session:
Fast___ ___ ___ ___ ___Slow

18. The number of topics presented were:
Too many___ ___ ___ ___ ___Too few

19. The content of the workshop was:
Worthwhile___ ___ ___ ___ ___Useless

20. The content of the workshop was:
Applicable___ ___ ___ ___ ___Not Applicable

21. The content of the workshop was:
Too theoretical___ ___ ___ ___ ___Not theoretical enough

The workshop staff would appreciate any suggestions you might have to improve the instruction or the organization of the workshop. You are free to make other observations if you like. Please use the space below or the back side of this page for your remarks.

APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
AACTE DRIVE-IN CONFERENCES
AT SAN FRANCISCO, MEMPHIS AND CHICAGO

ITEM	SITE	Frequency of Response YES	NO	OMITS*
1. Was the institute a worthwhile experience for you?	SF[1]	10	0	0
	Me[2]	11	0	0
	Ch[3]	6	0	0
2. Was the institute applicable to you?	SF	9	1	0
	Me	9	0	2
	Ch	6	0	0
3. Through such a conference as this one, is AACTE helping to meet your professional needs?	SF	10	0	0
	Me	9	0	2
	Ch	6	0	0
4. Has this conference made you more aware of any major issues in teacher education today?	SF	7	3	0
	Me	9	2	0
	Ch	4	1	1
5. Do you feel the need for multicultural education programs is one of the pressing problems in education today?	SF	10	0	0
	Me	11	0	0
	Ch	6	0	0
6. Do you feel the presenters provided enough time for questions and clarifying remarks?	SF	7	2	1
	Me	10	0	0
	Ch	5	1	0
7. Do you feel there is a need for a special teacher education program like CUTE to train inner-city teachers?	SF	9	0	1
	Me	11	0	0
	Ch	6	0	0
8. Do you think the CUTE program has the proper elements of a teacher education program to effectively prepare inner-city teachers?	SF	8	1	1
	Me	10	1	0
	Ch	5	0	1
9. Was the CUTE program explained adequately to you?	SF	9	0	1
	Me	9	0	2
	Ch	5	0	1
10. As a result of this conference have you developed an interest in the CUTE program?	SF	5	2	3
	Me	7	0	4
	Ch	5	0	1
11. Would the implementation of a CUTE program at your institution be feasible?	SF	1	5	4
	Me	7	0	4
	Ch	4	2	0
12. Would you be interested in attending a 5-day workshop this spring to train staffs to implement a CUTE program?	SF	3	5	2
	Me	10	0	1
	Ch	6	0	0
13. Do you think the institution with which you are affiliated would be willing to send you or some other representative to such a workshop?	SF	1	5	4
	Me	7	1	3
	Ch	5	1	0
14. Do you desire additional information on the CUTE program?	SF	4	2	4
	Me	6	3	2
	Ch	5	1	0

*Also includes persons who were undecided
[1]SF - San Francisco, Total N = 10
[2]Me - Memphis, Total N = 11
[3]Ch - Chicago, Total N = 6

APPENDIX D

M O N I T O R ' S R E P O R T

CUTE DIFFUSION 1973-74
Evaluation Checklist

Site Visited: _____ Visit # 1

Date: _____

Monitor: _____

Instructions: Upon completion of your site visit, based on your observations and interviews, respond to the following statements concerning the CUTE Program at the site you visited. Circle one response* for each item.

1.	An advisory committee is and has been involved in planning the CUTE program.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
2.	Every component of the program relates to the overall goal of training students to teach in the inner city.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
3.	All components of the program are moving toward specific objectives.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
4.	This program should accomplish the objectives delineated in the CUTE Manual.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
5.	The inner-city community (outside of the schools) is involved in the operation of this CUTE Program.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
6.	The program provides for flexibility.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
7.	The staff is following the installation plan submitted.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
8.	There is good cooperation among the staff from all three disciplines.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
9.	The staff is fulfilling its duties and responsibilities to the program.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
10.	Facilities are adequate for conducting the CUTE program.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
11.	The staff members are following the CUTE Manual.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
12.	The program director's role is clearly defined.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D.
13.	Program personnel roles are clearly defined.	1 2 3 4 5 I.D

*1 = lowest rating ("to no extent")
5 = highest rating ("to the greatest extent")
I.D.= insufficient data

14.	The program staff have a clear understanding of the educational objectives of the CUTE Program.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
15.	The members of the staff are implementing these objectives in terms of activities.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
16.	Plans for evaluating students have been made.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
17.	An open and honest relationship exists between students and staff.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
18.	An open and honest relationship exists among the students themselves.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
19.	Students are reacting positively and enthusiastically to the CUTE Program at this site.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
20.	Staff members are doing an adequate job of teaching the CUTE students.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
21.	Techniques of reflective inquiry are being utilized in student seminars.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
22.	Worthwhile field experiences are being planned or undertaken by CUTE students.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.
23.	Students have an opportunity to ventillate their fears, concerns and complaints at this site.	1	2	3	4	5 I.D.

1. What was your assessment of the project <u>during your visit</u>?

_____ Effective in all phases

_____ Effective in most phases

_____ Limited effectiveness

_____ Ineffective